

1 Joshua Briones (SBN 205293)
jbriones@mintz.com
2 Nicole V. Ozeran (SBN 302321)
nvozeran@mintz.com
3 MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY
4 AND POPEO P.C.
2029 Century Park East Suite 3100
5 Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: 310-586-3200
6 Facsimile: 310-586-3202

7 Claire C. Newland (SBN 301017)
ccnewland@mintz.com
8 MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY
9 AND POPEO P.C.
44 Montgomery Street, 36th Floor
10 San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: 415-432-6000
11 Facsimile: 415-432-6001

12 Attorneys for Defendant
13 Yelp Inc.

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
16 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
17

18 JONATHAN SAPAN, individually and on
Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

19 Plaintiff,

20 vs.

21 YELP INC., a Delaware Corporation,

22 Defendant.
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No. 3:17-cv-03240-JD

**DEFENDANT YELP INC.'S OPPOSITION
TO PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR
JUDICIAL NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION**

Hearing:

Date: April 19, 2018

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Dept.: 11

Judge: Honorable James Donato

Complaint Filed: June 6, 2017

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Defendant Yelp Inc. (“Yelp”) opposes Plaintiff Jonathan Sapan’s (“Plaintiff”) request for
3 judicial notice of the Federal Trade Commission National Do Not Call Registry Data Book for Fiscal
4 Year 2016 (the “Data Book”). Plaintiff’s request is inappropriate because the statistics in the Data
5 Book are disputable and not relevant to this litigation. Plaintiff improperly offers the Data Book for
6 the truth of the facts contained therein, and accordingly, the Court should deny its request for judicial
7 notice.

8 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

9 The Court may take judicial notice of matters that are either “generally known within the trial
10 court’s territorial jurisdiction” or “can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose
11 accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.” *U.S. v. Safran Group*, No. 15-CV-00746-LHK, 2017
12 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 137264, *20 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 25, 2017) (quoting Fed. R. Evid. 201(b)). “Further,
13 any evidence considered by the Court must be relevant evidence.” *Twitter, Inc. v. Sessions*, 263 F.
14 Supp. 3d 803, 806 n.2 (N.D. Cal. 2017) (denying the request for judicial notice in part because the
15 proffered documents were not relevant to any matter at issue); *see also* Fed. R. Evid. 401.

16 “[A] court may not take judicial notice of a fact that is ‘subject to reasonable dispute.’” *Lee*
17 *v. Los Angeles*, 250 F.3d 668, 689 (9th Cir. 2001) (quoting Fed. R. Evid. 201); *see In re Mora*, 199
18 F.3d 1024, 1026 n.3 (9th Cir. 1999). A court may not take judicial notice of the truth of the facts
19 contained in a document if they are disputable. *See Lawson v. Tehama Cty.*, No. 2:17-cv-1276 TLN
20 GGH, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14126, at *7-8 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 29, 2018) (“It appears that defendants
21 would desire to have the court take judicial notice of the truth of the facts contained therein. That the
22 court may not do.”).

23 Courts may take judicial notice of matters that are capable of immediate and accurate
24 verification through reliable sources (*i.e.*, dictionaries, encyclopedias). *See U.S. v. Mariscal*, 285 F.3d
25 1127, 1132 (9th Cir. 2002) (denying judicial notice because the Court was not directed to any source
26 that could verify certain facts).

1 **III. ARGUMENT**

2 The Data Book is not relevant to the facts of this case. When collecting its data, the National
3 Registry accepts all complaints regarding calls using a recorded message, regardless of the
4 registration status of the called number. *See* Pl.’s Req. for Judicial Notice (“Pl.’s RJN”) Ex. 19, at 5
5 n.1, ECF 66-2. This case does not concern recorded or automated calls. More significantly, the
6 proposed class members in this case would be registered on the Do Not Call (“DNC”) Registry. The
7 Data Book includes statistics about consumers who *are not* listed on the DNC Registry, and is
8 therefore outside the scope of this litigation. Additionally, consumers registered complaints by
9 responding affirmatively to either or both of two questions: “Have you asked this company to stop
10 calling you?” or “Was the call a recorded message?” *Id.* Plaintiff’s answer to both inquiries would
11 be no, and if he is typical of his class, class members’ responses would also be no. Accordingly, the
12 Data Book and the statistics contained therein are irrelevant and the Court should not be consider
13 them when determining the proposed class size.

14 The Data Book’s contents are also disputable and not readily verifiable. As stated in the Data
15 Book, the data is based on “unverified complaints reported by consumers.” Pl.’s RJN Ex. 18, at 3,
16 ECF 66-2. The Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”) does not disclose identifying information about
17 consumers who submitted complaints, or suggest that any such information exists. Moreover,
18 Plaintiff does not propose a method for verifying the facts contained in the Data Book, and the data
19 is not based on matters of common knowledge. *See Mariscal*, 285 F.3d at 1131. Although a FTC
20 Rule may be proper for judicial notice, a publication by the FTC containing disputable information is
21 not. A FTC Rule can be readily verified, but a publication containing a year’s worth of data
22 cannot. There is also no information as to how the data was compiled, analyzed, and culled. Because
23 the complaints are unverified *and* unverifiable, they are inherently unreliable and subject to dispute.

24 Plaintiff has failed to supply the necessary information as to why the statistics contained in
25 the Data Book are appropriate for judicial notice. Plaintiff does not specify which fact(s) should be
26 judicially noticed. Instead, Plaintiff states that the accuracy of “the statistics” in the Data Book, of
27 which there are many, “cannot reasonably be questioned,” but provides no support for this conclusory
28

1 statement. *See* Pl.’s RJN 2:5-6, ECF 66-2. Simply because a document is “published annually,
2 publicly noticed and is publicly available” does not make it accurate. *Id.*

3 **IV. CONCLUSION**

4 Yelp respectfully requests that this Court deny Plaintiff’s request for judicial notice of the
5 statistics contained in the Data Book.

6
7 Dated: March 23, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

8 MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY
9 AND POPEO P.C.

10 */s/ Claire C. Newland*

11 By: Joshua Briones
12 Nicole V. Ozeran
13 Claire C. Newland
14 Attorneys for Defendant Yelp Inc.